

Message Text

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 USUN N 00902 01 OF 02 140547Z
ACTION IO-14

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 AF-10 ARA-10 EA-10 EUR-12 NEA-10
CIAE-00 DODE-00 PM-05 H-01 INR-10 L-03 NSAE-00
PA-01 SP-02 SS-15 HA-05 ACDA-12 NSCE-00 SSO-00
USIE-00 INRE-00 /121 W
-----096688 140628Z /14

O 140410Z MAR 78
FM USMISSION USUN NEW YORK
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 0026
INFO AMEMBASSY BONN
AMEMBASSY DAR ES SALAAM
AMEMBASSY GABORONE
AMEMBASSY LAGOS
AMEMBASSY LONDON IMMEDIATE
AMEMBASSY LUSAKA
AMEMBASSY MAPUTO
AMEMBASSY OTTAWA
AMEMBASSY PARIS
AMEMBASSY PRETORIA
AMCONSUL CAPE TOWN

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 01 OF 02 USUN NEW YORK 00902

CAPE TOWN FOR EMBASSY

E.O. 11652: GDS
TAGS: PORG, UNSC, RH
SUBJECT: DEVELOPMENTS ON DRAFT SECURITY COUNCIL
RESOLUTIONS

REF: USUN 886

1. SUMMARY. EIGHT NON-ALIGNED MEMBERS OF UN SECURITY
COUNCIL MARCH 13 INTRODUCED DRAFT
RESOLUTION ON RHODESIA BASED ON AFRICAN DRAFT CONTAINED
USUN 878. WESTERN FIVE AGREED TO MAKE ANOTHER EFFORT
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 USUN N 00902 01 OF 02 140547Z

WITH AFRICANS TO SECURE REVISIONS. EARLIER AFRICANS
HAD REJECTED BRITISH DRAFT. END SUMMARY.

2. FOLLOWING INTRODUCTION IN SC OF REVISED AFRICAN
RESOLUTION BY EIGHT NON-ALIGNED MEMBERS (SEPTTEL),
WESTERN FIVE MET TO CONSIDER NEW TACTICAL SITUATION.
RICHARD, SUGGESTED BEST COURSE WAS TO SUBMIT AMENDMENTS,

WHICH WOULD PROBABLY NOT RECEIVE NECESSARY NINE VOTES BUT WOULD CLEARLY PLACE ON RECORD WHAT FIVE COULD SUPPORT. HE THOUGHT AMENDMENT MIGHT CALL FOR DELETION OF OPER PARAS 2, 3 AND 4 OF NON-ALIGNED DRAFT AND SUBSTITUTION OF OPER PARAS 2, 3 AND 4 OF BRITISH DRAFT. HE NOTED UK DID NOT LIKE REF TO "ALL MEASURES NECESSARY" IN OPER PARA 5 BUT THOUGHT HE COULD POINT OUT IN STATEMENT THAT BRITAIN INTERPRETED THIS AS NOT CALLING FOR USE OF FORCE.

3. IN DISCUSSION THAT FOLLOWED, BRITISH EXPLAINED THE DIFFICULTIES THEY HAVE WITH VARIOUS PROVISIONS OF RESOLUTION AS FOLLOWS.

- A) BRITISH CANNOT CALL INTERNAL SETTLEMENT "UNACCEPTABLE". RICHARD SUGGESTED THEY MIGHT BE ABLE TO CALL IT "SERIOUSLY INADEQUATE" AND POSSIBILITY WAS DISCUSSED OF TRYING TO REVISE PARA LONG LINES OF PARA 4 OF REVISED BRITISH RESOLUTION (SEE BELOW), BUT IT WAS AGREED THAT THIS WOULD NOT MEET AFRICANS' DESIRES. FIVE FINALLY CONCLUDED THAT THERE WAS VIRTUALLY NO PROSPECT FOR REACHING AGREEMENT WITH AFRICANS ON WORDING FOR THIS PARAGRAPH.

- B) FIFOOT (UK) SOUGHT TO EXPLAIN LEGAL PROBLEMS UK HAS WITH WORDING OF PARA 3. HE SAID BRITISH POSITION IS THAT IT IS NOT FOR SC TO SAY HOW LEGALITY CAN BE RESTORED IN RHODESIA. THIS IS CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 USUN N 00902 01 OF 02 140547Z

FOR BRITISH PARLIAMENT TO DETERMINE. WORDING STIPULATING "REPLACEMENT OF ITS MILITARY AND POLICE FORCES" AS CRITERION FOR LEGALITY OF SOLUTION THUS GIVES BRITISH GREAT PROBLEM. ALL AGREED THAT DELETION OF THIS WORDING WOULD LEAVE PARAGRAPH RATHER NONSENSICAL, BUT REVISION THAT TOOK CARE OF BRITISH PROBLEM WAS CONSIDERED POSSIBLE. WHETHER FORMULATION COULD BE FOUND THAT WAS ALSO ACCEPTABLE TO AFRICANS WAS NOT CLEAR, BUT FIVE CONSIDERED IT WORTH A TRY.

- C) IN OPER PARA 4 BRITISH CANNOT ACCEPT FINAL WORDS: "UNDER UN SUPERVISION" SINCE THEY CONSIDER THIS WOULD MEAN THE UN WOULD CONTROL THE ELECTION PROCESS, NOT THE UK AS ADMINISTERING POWER. AFTER SUGGESTIONS OF "OBSERVATION" OR "MONITORING" WERE DISCUSSED, RICHARD SAID HE THOUGHT THEY COULD ACCEPT "WITH APPROPRIATE UN PARTICIPATION".

- D) BRITISH WOULD PREFER "ALL APPROPRIATE MEASURES" IN OPER PARA 5, IN PLACE OF "ALL MEASURES NECESSARY".

- E) IN OPER PARA 6 BRITISH WOULD PREFER

"ALL THE PARTIES" IN PLACE OF "THE PARTIES CONCERNED"
SINCE IT IS ASSUMED LATTER PHRASE IS DESIGNED TO
EXCLUDE SMITH AND NATIONALISTS ASSOCIATED WITH HIM
IN INTERNAL SETTLEMENT. THIS CHANGE AND THAT IN
PARA 5 DO NOT, HOWEVER, SEEM TO BE POINTS ON
WHICH THEY WOULD INSIST.

4. FIVE FINALLY AGREED THAT EFFORT SHOULD BE MADE
WITH AFRICANS TO NEGOTIATE DIFFERENCES DOWN TO MINIMUM
POINT. SOME POSSIBILITY SEEMS TO EXIST FOR ACHIEVING
AGREEMENT ON ALL PROVISIONS EXCEPT OPER PARA 2, ALTHOUGH
PARA 3 ALSO PRESENTS MAJOR DIFFICULTY. AT RICHARD'S
SUGGESTION, IT WAS AGREED THAT MCHENRY SHOULD SOULD(##)
OUT AFRICANS ON POSSIBILITIES OF NEGOTIATIONS AND
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 USUN N 00902 01 OF 02 140547Z

FIVE WOULD MEET AGAIN AT 11:00 MARCH 14.

NOTE BY OC/T: (##)AS RECEIVED.

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 USUN N 00902 02 OF 02 140622Z

ACTION IO-14

INFO OCT-01 AF-10 EUR-12 ISO-00 ARA-10 EA-10 NEA-10
CIAE-00 DODE-00 PM-05 H-01 INR-10 L-03 NSAE-00
PA-01 SP-02 SS-15 HA-05 ACDA-12 NSCE-00 SSO-00
USIE-00 INRE-00 /121 W

-----096960 140628Z /11

O 140410Z MAR 78

FM USMISSION USUN NEW YORK

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 0027

INFO AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY DAR ES SALAAM

AMEMBASSY GABORONE

AMEMBASSY LAGOS

AMEMBASSY LONDON IMMEDIATE

AMEMBASSY LUSAKA

AMEMBASSY MAPUTO

AMEMBASSY OTTAWA

AMEMBASSY PARIS

AMEMBASSY PRETORIA
AMCONSUL CAPE TOWN

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 02 OF 02 USUN NEW YORK 00902

5. NONE OF THE FIVE WERE ABLE TO SAY HOW THEY WOULD VOTE ON NON-ALIGNED TEXT AS IT NOW STANDS. SINCE VOTE ON IT IS POSSIBLE MARCH 14, REQUEST CONTINGENCY INSTRUCTIONS IN EVENT NO REVISIONS ARE MADE.

6. AT MORNING MEETING OF FIVE MARCH 13, RICHARD HAD PRESENTED REVISED WORDING TO NEW PARA 4 OF BRITISH RESOLUTION REPORTED REFTEL. BARTON (CANADA) POINTED OUT "GUARANTEE" LANGUAGE IMPLIED SALISBURY AGREEMENT COULD RESULT IN A SETTLEMENT THAT CONFORMS TO PARA 3. HE THOUGHT THIS WOULD BE PROVOCATIVE TO AFRICANS. FIVE AGREED ON NEW REVISION, AS FOLLOWS: "CONSIDERS THAT IN THE LIGHT OF THE CRITERIA SET FOURTH IN CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 USUN N 00902 02 OF 02 140622Z

PARAGRAPH 3 OF THIS RESOLUTION, THE PROVISIONS OF THE AGREEMENT SIGNED IN SALISBURY ON 3 MARCH 1978 ARE INADEQUATE." HOWEVER, DURING TELECON WITH LONDON SUBSEQUENTLY, RICHARD WAS NOT AUTHORIZED TO PROCEED WITH THIS LANGUAGE, PENDING CLEARANCE WITH OWEN, AND INSTEAD LONDON PROPOSED FOLLOWING NEW WORDING TO REPLACE LANGUAGE AFTER "INADEQUATE": "TO ENSURE THAT THE PRINCIPLES SET OUT IN PARA 3 OF THIS RESOLUTION ARE FULLY IMPLEMENTED."

7. MCHENRY PRESENTED THREE DEPT SUGGESTIONS SET FORTH PARA 5 OF STATE 63438. RICHARD ACCEPTED FIRST AND THIRD BUT WAS RELUCTANT ON SECOND, AND IT WAS NOT INCORPORATED. LATER, LONDON ALSO WITHHELD AUTHORIZATION FOR HIM TOMAKE THIRD CHANGE--IN OPER PARA 3(A)--PENDING FURTHER STUDY, AND IT WAS NOT INCORPORATED IN TEXT GIVEN TO AFRICANS. (IT SHOULD BE NOTED THAT IF WE ADOPT RICHARD SUGGESTION, ABOVE, TO SUBMIT PARAS 2, 3 AND 4 OF BRITISH DRAFT AS AMENDMENTS TO NON-ALIGNED DRAFT, IT IS NOT NOW CLEAR WHETHER OUR REVISION WOULD BE INCORPORATED OR NOT.)

8. FRENCH STATED THEY COULD NOT ACCEPT REFERENCE TO GA RESOLUTION 1514(XV) IN OPER PARA 2, IN LINE WITH LONG-STANDING POSITION. ALL AGREED FINAL WORDS "IN ACCORDANCE WITH GA RESOLUTION 1514(XV)" COULD BE DELETED, ENDING SENTENCE AFTER "INDEPENDENCE".

9. MCHENRY THEN PRESENTED REVISIONS TO AFRICAN

DRAFT SUGGESTED IN STATE 63438. OTHERS ASSUMED
THEY WOULD BE UNACCEPTABLE TO AFRICANS, BUT
MCHENRY NOTED THEIR PRESENTATION WOULD INDICATE WE
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 USUN N 00902 02 OF 02 140622Z

HAD NOT IGNORED AFRICAN TEXT AND WERE PREPARED TO
NEGOTIATION ON BASIS OF IT.

10. ALL AGREED RICHARD SHOULD MAKE APPROACH TO
RAMPHUL AND SALIM. WHEN GROUP REASSEMBLED PRIOR
TO AFTERNOON SC MEETING RICHARD REPORTED THAT SALIM
HAD NOT TURNED UP FOR MEETING. RAMPHUL HAD EXPRESSED
DIFFICULTIES WITH PARA 4, EMPHASIZING AFRICAN DESIRE
FOR CLEAR STATEMENT THAT INTERNAL SETTLEMENT WAS
UNACCEPTABLE AND ILLEGAL. HE HAD
AGREED TO CONSULT THE AFRICAN GROUP
ON THE TEXT, HOWEVER, RICHARD HAD NOT PRESENTED
US SUGGESTIONS FOR REVISION OF AFRICAN DRAFT,
HE SAID, BECAUSE UK COULD NOT ACCEPT THAT DRAFT
EVEN WITH OUR REVISIONS.

11. AFRICAN GROUP MET TO CONSIDER BRITISH RESOLUTION
JUST PRIOR TO SC MEETING. BEFORE COUNCIL CONVENED
WE LEARNED FROM RAMPHUL AND OTHERS THAT
BRITISH TEXT WAS UNACCEPTABLE AND THAT
NON-ALIGNED WOULD INTRODUCE RESOLUTION DURING MEETING.
ONLY SIGNIFICANT CHANGE FROM AFRICAN DRAFT WAS
REVISION OF OPER PARA 1 (DETAILS SEPTTEL). YOUNG

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 jan 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: NONALIGNED NATIONS, TEXT, UNSC RESOLUTIONS, GOVERNMENT REACTIONS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 14 mar 1978
Decaption Date: 01 jan 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 20 Mar 2014
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1978USUNN00902
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: GS
Errors: N/A
Expiration:
Film Number: D780112-0767
Format: TEL
From: USUN NEW YORK
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1978/newtext/t19780368/aaaacgbj.tel
Line Count: 256
Litigation Code IDs:
Litigation Codes:
Litigation History:
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Message ID: b5ff6dc7-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Office: ACTION IO
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 5
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: 78 USUN NEW YORK 886
Retention: 0
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 28 apr 2005
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review Media Identifier:
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
SAS ID: 3331388
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: DEVELOPMENTS ON DRAFT SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTIONS
TAGS: PORG, PDEV, RH, US, UK, GE, FR, CA, UNSC
To: STATE
Type: TE
vdkgvwkey: odbc://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS_Docs/b5ff6dc7-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Review Markings:
Sheryl P. Walter
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
20 Mar 2014
Markings: Sheryl P. Walter Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 20 Mar 2014